

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
EUGENE DIVISION

JULIE TAYLOR-SHELTON,
Plaintiff,

Case 6:17-cv-01195-MK
ORDER

v.
CREDIT ASSOCIATES, INC.,
Defendant.

AIKEN, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Thomas Coffin filed his Findings and Recommendation ("F&R") (doc. 33) recommending that Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgement and Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgement be denied. Defendant then timely filed objections to the F&R (doc. 35). The matter is now before me. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). When either party objects to any portion of a magistrate judge's F&R, the district court must make a de novo determination of that portion of the magistrate judge's report. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, Inc.*, 656 F.2d

1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982). Based on my review of the F&R and the documents in the case, I find no error in Judge Coffin's F&R and Defendant's objections do not undermine Judge Coffin's analysis. Thus, I adopt Judge Coffin's F&R (doc. 33) in its entirety. Accordingly, Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgement (doc. 21) and Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgement (doc. 25) are DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 25th day of March, 2019.



Ann Aiken
United States District Judge